

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al

-vs-

ARAKI, Sadao, et al

SWORN DEPOSITION

Deponent: KOISO, Kuniaki

Having first duly sworn an oath as on attached sheet and in accordance with the procedure followed in my country, I hereby depose as follows:

1. With regard to the HARADA Diary (Court Exhibit 3150) and my relations with HARADA.

Before replying to the evidence tendered by the Prosecution during their rebuttal as being related to me, I should like to state certain matters which I consider to be necessary in connection with the HARADA Diary and my relations with HARADA.

I first became acquainted with HARADA about 1930 and since then met him several times. I know that from before the time I came to know him he was active as a private secretary to Prince SAIONJI, purveying to the Genro information about the political world and that he continued to perform that function up to the Prince's death.

However, I also knew that besides HARADA, one NAKAGAWA, Kōjuro, who was long in the service of Prince SAIONJI as private secretary was in charge of all the personal affairs of the prince. Although I have forgotten whose information it was, I had occasion to receive the following report about HARADA:

"Although HARADA is in his mind secretly contending against private secretary NAKAGAWA to win the favor of Prince SAIONJI, there is no controversy of any kind between the two because NAKAGAWA is a splendid character who is exceedingly indifferent about such a thing. But it is certain that the Prince does not trust HARADA very much."

Such being the case, although I met HARADA whenever he requested an interview, not once have I ever requested a meeting on my part nor have I ever given him information whether at the orders of my superiors or on my own initiative.

Until about the summer of 1947, I had no knowledge that HARADA had kept a diary. When informed that there were entries in the diary relating to me, I borrowed from my counsel excerpts of such entries and carefully read through them. As a result, I noted the following defects in the entries insofar as they related to me:

- a. That most of them are hearsay.
- b. That they are highly flavored with dogmatic imagination, surmise, and speculation.
- c. That the contents of preceeding and following entries contain contradictions.
- d. Although difficult to judge whether they are the result

of willful intent or mental defect, that the motives of the interview, the place of the interview and the contents of conversations are distorted and falsified.

- e. That entries relating to the army and to me reflect his personal emotional likes and dislikes.

I shall now refute on the basis of facts all the evidence tendered by the prosecution from the HARADA Diary, allegedly as having some connection with me, as entirely lacking in reliability.

2. With regard to the evidence in Court Exhibit 3756-A to the effect that although the accused MINAMI, the then War Minister, and Finance Minister INOUE had made an agreement between them on a plan for reform of military organization of the army, it was overthrown because of opposition by the then Director of the Military Affairs Bureau, the accused KOISO.

In April 1931, at the time he assumed the office of War Minister, the accused MINAMI, in view of public opinion, decided upon a policy to reduce the army and created the Committee for the Study of Reform of Military Organization with War Vice Minister SUGIYAMA, Gen, as chairman, the task assigned to the committee being the study and formulation of a concrete plan for the reduction of the army. I, then Director of the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry, was appointed as one of the members of the committee.

In my affidavit (Court Exhibit 3375) which was read before the Tribunal on 31 October 1947, I stated: "about the time of the

outbreak of the Manchurian Incident in September of the same year, a proposal was under consideration to further reduce our peacetime strength of 17 divisions by reducing and changing the Imperial Bodyguard Division to simply the Imperial Bodyguards and abolishing the two divisions of Utsunomiya and Kyoto." This was as a result of discussions by this committee. This fact is proof that War Minister MINAMI and the members of the Committee together made efforts for the materialization of the plan for the reduction of the army and, at the same time, refutes the authenticity of the entry in the HARADA Diary, Court Exhibit 3754-B, to the effect that the Kokuhonsha, in concert with the army, was engaged in obstructionist maneuvers against reduction of the army. It also serves as evidence to deny HARADA's statement about the activities of the Kokuhonsha.

To carry out the plan for the reduction of the army by two and a half divisions, initial expenses of a considerable sum was necessary for the transportation of troops and military goods, the replenishment of equipment and materials required for the mechanization of army units to be transferred, the new creation of a part of the barracks and storehouses accompanying the mechanization of army units, the payment of money grants to troops to be reduced and disbanded and travel expenses to their homes, etc. Because of this, the army's budget in the early stage of the execution of the reduction plan increased as compared with normal years.

As Finance Minister, INOUE was a leader of the Minseito Party, it was his desire to have the Minseito Cabinet get the nominal credit for effecting the reduction of the army, but at the same time to push on as the burden of the next cabinet the troublesome problem of effectuating the army reduction plan with all the initial expenses it entailed. With this idea, he proposed to the War Minister MINAMI that because of financial circumstances, he would like to have the period of execution of the plan postponed to the next fiscal year. War Minister MINAMI gave his approval to the effectuation of the reduction plan, but stated he would give a definite reply with regard to the question of the time for the effectuation later after getting the views of the administrative departments in charge of the matter and left Finance Minister INOUE. The War Minister then called Vice Minister SUGIYAMA, the chairman of the committee, and sought his views on the proposition.

Now the committee, while it desired the materialization of the mechanization of the army as soon as possible, had already unanimously agreed that upon adoption of the army reduction plan it was essential that its effectuation be commenced at the beginning of next year at the latest not only because the contents of the plan might gradually leak out if its effectuation were postponed with a consequent harmful effect on the officers and men of the army,

but also because in the light of bitter experiences in the past, the effectivation of the plan would in all likelihood be retarded by frantic movements by members of the House of Peers and the House of Representatives, in alignment with the officials and the public in their political constituencies, to keep the army units in their localities for the purpose of maintaining local prosperity. This being the case, SUGIYAMA, the chairman of the committee, replied to the inquiry from War Minister MINAMI to the above effect. It is needless to say that as a member of the committee I also was an earnest advocate of immediate effectivation of the adopted plan for army reduction. However, as the direct report was made by Vice Minister SUGIYAMA, the committee chairman, as stated above, I at no time expressed my opinions directly to the War Minister.

The above being the actual situation, I and the director of the Intendance Bureau were the advocates of immediate effectivation of the army reduction plan and Finance Minister INOUE whom HARADA supported was, on the contrary, an advocate of postponement of the plan.

Although HARADA's statements are distortions based upon emotional likes and dislikes, yet even then if one thoroughly reads the passages which precede and follow this Court Exhibit one can clearly perceive therein a part of the actual facts of the case which I have related. Notwithstanding this, because the

prosecution have tendered to the Tribunal as evidence only such parts as would appear unfavorable to the accused, the Tribunal is apt to have been given the opposite impression as if I prevented the effectivation of the army reduction plan and I feel it especially necessary to call the Tribunal's attention to this fact.

3. With regard to the evidence contained in Court Exhibit No. 3801-B to the effect that on 8 May 1939 I had an interview with HARADA at my request at his relative's house and that I said that unless the Tripartite Alliance was not concluded the officers and men at the front would not be pacified.

This exhibit, as my counsel, Mr. Brook, pointed out to the Tribunal on 22 January 1948, is only a short passage excerpted from the HARADA Diary, the contents of which taken alone creates the misunderstanding that they constitute my views. The facts are otherwise. By noting the words "it was a usual pet expression" in the entry which follows the passages in this exhibit and by proper construction of the Japanese text, it is obvious that they were not my views.

Moreover, the entry continues to say, "General KOISO was saying almost the same thing." Although "almost the same" is an ambiguous expression, because it creates the impression that I too was an alliance advocate, I shall now give a true account of what actually took place at the interview to prove that the subject of the discussion was not the pro and con of an alliance and to show that this exhibit is valueless.

Although I do not clearly recall the exact date, it is a fact that I met HARADA in the early part of May 1939. However, this interview did not take place at my request. At first HARADA proposed a talk with me over dinner, but I declined the invitation explaining that I was extremely busy. However, since he strongly insisted that I consent to an interview by all means saying that he did not mind if it was after I had finished

my work, I reluctantly consented and after I completed my work for the day and had dinner went to the place designated by HARA-Da at about 8:30 p.m. The meeting place was not the home of his relative as he records in the entry accepted as a Court Exhibit, but residence of Mr. YAMASHITA, Kamesaburo, in Takanawa, Shinagawa Ward (Tokyo). Although this has no direct bearing on the issues of this Trial, I mention this because, even though it may not be known wherein HARA-Da's true intentions lay in fabricating the motive and the place of the interview, I believe that it would serve the purpose of discrediting this entry.

When at the outset of the meeting I asked HARA-Da what the purpose of the interview was, he replied, "To ask your opinions regarding the HIRANUMA message." I had actually no knowledge of what he called the "HIRANUMA message" and so I asked him for his explanation and learned for the first time the general outline of what it was. However, I was never able to judge from the very beginning the real meaning of its contents.

HARA-Da then continued to ask me, "I want to ask your opinion whether, in the event a Tripartite Alliance is concluded on the basis of the HIRANUMA message and if Germany and Italy commenced war with England and France, Japan would come to participate in the war?" Whereupon I replied, "Putting aside the pro and con of concluding an alliance as a separate question, if the HIRANUMA message really provides, as you explain, armed assistance by Japan within possible limits and, moreover, if Japan, in the event Germany and Italy commenced war with England and France, effectuated armed assistance to Germany and Italy, should it not be interpreted as

meaning nothing more and nothing less than war participation?" and thus gave expression to my construction of the so-called "HIRANUMA message". Upon hearing my view, HARADA, his face somewhat flushed with excitement, denounced the attitude of the Army favoring conclusion of an alliance and repeatedly argued that even in case it should be concluded in accordance with the "HIRANUMA message" Japan should never participate in war.

I did not venture to defend what was alleged to be the Army's attitude and I withheld expressing to loose-tongued HARADA my own personal views which I had always held opposing the conclusion of an alliance. Instead I asked him what Prince SAIONJI's views were on the pro and con of an alliance. Whereupon he replied that the Prince was not a person who expressed his own views lightly and continued repeatedly to extol the Prince's prudent attitude.

Since there appeared no further business in addition to what we talked about as described above, I took leave at about 10:30 p.m.

Comparing the actual circumstances which I have related above with Court Exhibit No. 3801-B, the contents of the HARADA Diary is fundamentally at variance with the facts. Especially if one refers to an entry in Chapter 321 of the diary (18 April 1939), it is clear that he had been informed by someone and had known that I was opposed to the Tripartite Alliance. Yet, despite this fact, the Prosecution may be believed to have come to suspect whether I was not an alliance advocate because of an alleged contradictory entry such as is given in this exhibit.

Notwithstanding the fact that I had inquired about Prince SAIONJI's views and HARADA had praised the Prince's attitude as I have stated above, there is no mention about the Prince in the entry following the one contained in this exhibit; the contents of our conversation have been altered and it consists of a defense of the attitude of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal YUASA which I least expected. This is clearly a conspicuous example of HARADA distorting and fabricating the contents of conversations and shows how little credibility, if any, the diary has.

What I further wish to state to the Tribunal is that although the Prosecution said (transcript page 37,813), " . . . he never expressed his views on the subject on any other occasion except one, when in May 1939 at the request of the War Vice-Minister he was asked to help to restore friendly relations between the War and Navy Ministers who had offered their views concerning the contents of the conclusion of the alliance ", I have never expressed my private views on the pro and con of the alliance to HARADA, as I have mentioned above. In addition, I stated in my affidavit (Court Exhibit No. 3375) at No. 21 of the original: "With regard to this question, neither at any cabinet meeting which I attended nor at any other meeting which I can recall." In consequence of the fact that the word "meeting" was mistranslated in English as "occasion", it may possibly be that this invited the misunderstanding of the Prosecution, and I call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that if there had been no such misunderstanding, this exhibit might not have been tendered.

4. With regard to Court Exhibit No. 3806-A, pertaining to a character comment about me purported to have been made by the accused ARAKI, I do not know whether or not the contents in this exhibit represent the expressions of the accused ARAKI. Furthermore, with regard to the comment on my character, "KOISO is a person who has power and enthusiasm, but he has no set opinions and deals only in intrigues and trickery", it is not for me to say anything except that it may serve me as food for self-reflection. However, I must solemnly refute with proof such a false statement, whoever may be its author, and which can be taken as a basis for the comment on my character, that I advocated the use of counterfeit paper currency at the Cabinet Meeting or that I sent the kempei to China and Manchuria in plain clothes.

That I ever advocated such a thing as the use of counterfeit paper money when I was Minister of Overseas Affairs, whether at a cabinet meeting or on any other occasion is completely groundless and there is no room for doubt that it was a misunderstanding of some kind or a misrepresentation.

If the statement that I dispatched the kempei (military police) to China and Manchuria disguised in plain clothes is to serve as a pretext for casting aspersions at me, since as Minister for Overseas Affairs I had no connection at that time with the Kempei Tai, then we must assume that the period is confined to a time when I as director of the Military Affairs Bureau or Vice Minister of War was in a position to give advice on kempei matters. Supposing this refers to such a period of my career

and that ARAKI spoke of this to HARA, then there can be no mistake that it was at a time when ARAKI (who would never under no circumstances permit anything of the kind) was not in the post of War Minister. In other words, the matter concerns a period of one year and four months extending from August 1930, prior to the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident, to 12 December 1931, shortly after that outbreak, while serving as director of the Military Affairs Bureau under two Ministers, UGAKI and MINAMI. As the Tribunal is already well aware with regard to the relative strength of Japanese and Chinese troops in Manchuria at that time, the strength of the Japanese forces just before the outbreak of the incident was only 10,400 as compared to that of the Chinese who had 220,000 men. Even after adding the troops which crossed the border from Korea soon after the outbreak of the incident the total strength did not come up even to 15,000. For this reason the Kwantung Army reported the serious lack of combat troops and expressed the earnest desire that if it was possible to send reinforcements from the Japanese homeland, they wanted the dispatch of even one more combat soldier instead of military police. That was the actual situation. Furthermore, in North China, where a Japanese garrison including military police was stationed, there was only a minor disturbance in Tientsin in November 1931, but other than that tranquillity prevailed generally and there was no request for additional military police. Such being the case, there was not even a single occasion which gave any rise to a need to dispatch to Manchuria and China any reinforcement of military police disguised in civilian clothes to conceal them from the public.

Ref. Doc. #3066

eye, either immediately before or after the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident. Furthermore, regardless of whether or not there was any order from the War Minister, no such steps were ever carried out.

Thus, as I have offered proof in refutation, this exhibit, founded upon falsification, constitutes a malicious character evidence against me. In view of the ruling of the Tribunal that it will not accept character testimony as evidence, I respectfully ask that this exhibit be stricken out.

Def. Doc. #3066

eye, either immediately before or after the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident. Furthermore, regardless of whether or not there was any order from the War Minister, no such steps were ever carried out.

Thus, as I have offered proof in refutation, this exhibit, founded upon falsification, constitutes a malicious character evidence against me. In view of the ruling of the Tribunal that it will not accept character testimony as evidence, I respectfully ask that this exhibit be stricken out.

Def. Doc. 3066

5. With regard to erroneous evidence in Court Exhibit No. 3757-A that the accused MINAMI dispatched TATEKAWA to Mukden

As there is no reference to me in this exhibit the exhibit itself does not bear on me in any way. However, the Prosecution notwithstanding the fact that the reason itself which they gave in explaining the tender contained contradictions, ventured to mention my name and stated as follows:

" . . . Minami while admitting that Tatekawa was sent to Mukden by the General Staff and that he had talked with him before he went, denied that he or as far as he knew, Koiso had anything to do with his selection or that he entrusted Tatekawa with a letter or order from the Emperor or anybody else."

In view of this statement of the Prosecution, I offer the following refutation;

Because TATEKAWA was a division chief in the Army General Staff office only his direct superior, the Chief of Staff, could order his selection and dispatch and it was a matter which permitted of no interference by anyone else. This fact is clear from the testimony of the accused MINAMI and of the witness KAWABE. That the matter was carried out in that very manner as a fact was testified to by me in my affidavit.

I believe the fact that the Prosecution recognized in its explanation of their reason for the tender that TATEKAWA was dispatched by the Army General Staff was a result of their coming to understand the principle mentioned above. Yet, notwithstanding it, the Prosecution, on the one hand, offered an excerpt from

Def. Doc. 3066

the HARADA Diary, just as it is, containing the erroneous information that MINAMI had dispatched TATEKAWA and, on the other hand, gave an explanation to the effect that KOISO of the War Ministry could interfere in or ignore the right of command of the Chief of the Army General Staff, all of which I am at a complete loss to understand.

The Prosecution's grounds for explaining that KOISO had something to do with the selection of TATEKAWA may have been found in a passage in an entry following the one in the Exhibit, but in the last sentence the words "it seems" are used. The Tribunal's attention is called to the fact that in the Japanese language the expression "it seems" means "one's own surmise and speculation", and the value is even lower than hearsay which has no evidential value.

In short, the fact that the contents of this Exhibit and those of related entries in the HARADA Diary are confused and incoherent and filled with many incomprehensible statements is due to nothing else than that he, HARADA, was ignorant of the system of the chain of command within the army to begin with, as well as other matters relating to the army. Especially the fact that HARADA used the expression "it seems" is proof that of all the surmise and speculation which his entries contain he admits his lack of confidence in what he put down in this one.

I absolutely did not interfere in the selection and dispatch of Major General TATEKAWA, a matter which under the chain of

Def. Doc. 3066

command, could not be done without arbitrarily violating the authority of the Chief of the Army General Staff.

6. With regard to Court Exhibit No. 3754-B in connection with the character and purpose of the KOKUHONSHA

Through this Exhibit, an entry in the HARADA Diary, the Prosecution represented the Kokuhonsha as an extreme rightist organization which, in concert with the army, engaged in maneuvers against the army reduction question and tendered it to the Tribunal on the grounds that it was not an organization such as I described in reply to questions from Prosecutor Fixel during my cross-examination in November 1947.

Moreover, there is no relation between the character and purpose of the Kokuhonsha and my statement in reply to Prosecutor Fixel's questions, for, as it is clear from my reply at the time on page 32,275 of the Transcript, I did not know the purpose of the Kokuhonsha because no one ever informed me about it and, although I stated that I regarded the magazine Kokuhon as providing instructive data with which to understand the true nature of Japan and the Japanese people, I did not refer to the character of the Kokuhonsha.

Again, as it is clear in page 32,274 of the Transcript, I became a member of the Kokuhonsha when I was a regimental commander in the provinces for the purpose of subscribing to its magazine and only on one occasion attended a lecture meeting

Def. Doc. 3066

sponsored by it and so I do not have the qualification to speak of the character and purpose of this society with any confidence and responsibility. However, as I am familiar with the actual circumstances attending the question of army reduction, having been directly concerned with the business administration of the matter and knowing that no outsider was permitted to interfere in its study and deliberations, as I have described in section two of this affidavit, if HARADA's falsified statement that the Kokuhonsha, in concert with the army, maneuvered against the army reduction question applies to the period when I held office in the War Ministry, then I positively deny that it is true.

In short, this Exhibit was tendered by the Prosecution to show what they claim to be the character of the Kokuhonsha by distorting my reply to Prosecutor Fixel and the Exhibit itself does not concern me. This fact is also clear by the statement made by Mr. Warren, counsel for the accused HIRANUMA on 16 January 1948 (Transcript page 37,564).

Def. Doc. 3066

On this 30th day of January 1948
At I.M.T.F.E.

DEPONENT: KOISO Kuniaki (seal)

I, Sanmonji Shohei, hereby certify that the above statement was sworn by the Deponent, who affixed his signature and seal thereto in the presence of this witness.

On the same date
At the same place.

Witness: /s/ Sanmonji Shohei (seal)

O A T H

In accordance with my conscience I swear to tell the whole truth, withholding nothing and adding nothing.

/s/ Koiso Kuniaki (seal)

Def. Doc. # 3066

Exh. No.

6, Feb. 1948

Errata Sheet (KOISO)

Correction should be made as follows: --

14 line, page 2

"wether" should be read "either".

17 line, page 12

After "misrepresentation", insert, "also it is
inconceivable for the reason set out in paragraph
2 of Def. Doc. 3059".

4 line, page 13

After "In other words, the matter ...", insert,
"could only".

Def. Doc. # 3066

Exh. No.

6, Feb. 1948

Errata Sheet (KOISO)

Correction should be made as follows: --

14 line, page 2

"wether" should be read "either".

17 line, page 12

After "misrepresentation", insert, "also it is
inconceivable for the reason set out in paragraph
2 of Def. Doc. 3059".

4 line, page 13

After "In other words, the matter ...", insert,
"could only".

Def. Doc. #3086

Exh. No.---

起東國原軍裁判所

亞米利加合衆國其他

司

荒 木 貞 夫 其他

宣誓供述書

供 述 者 小 義 國 昭

目分儀證口ニ行ハルル方式ニ從ヒ先ヅ別紙ノ通りノ宣誓ヲ爲シタル上次ノ
如ク供述致シマス

一、原田日記（法廷證三一五〇）及原田ト私トノ關係ニ就テ

觀察尙反駁段階中私ニ關係アリトシテ法廷ニ提出セラレタル證據ニ對シ反證ノ爲陳述スルニ先立テ原田日記及原田ト私トノ關係ニ就キ必要ナリト思盡セラル、事項ニ付陳述致シマス。

私ハ一九三〇年頃初メテ原田ヲ知り其後數回會致シマシタガ彼ハ私ガ彼ヲ知りマシタ以前カラ西園寺公ニ對スル政界情報ノ提供ヲ密書トシテ活動シ同公ノ死去スル迄勸誘シテ居タコトヲ承知シテ居リマス。

然シ私ハ原田ノ外ニ中川小十郎トイフ人が古クカラ西園寺公ノ密書トシテハ公ノ身邊一切ヲ經營シテ居タコトヲ承知シテ居リマシタ。

然ルニ、誰ノ話デアツタカハ失念シマシタガ原田ニ關シ次ノ様ナ報告ニ接シマシタ。

原田ハ心中働カニ西園寺公ヨリノ勸誘ヲ中川密書ト等ツテ居ル

ガ中川秘書ハ此點至極恬淡ナ立派ナ人物ナルガ爲中川、原田、兩
者間ニハ何ノ紛争モナイガ公ガ原田ヲ左邊信用シテ居ラレヌコト
ハ慥カデアアル。

以上ノ事情ニ依リ私ハ原田カラ申入ガアツタ場合ハ面會モシマシタ
ガ、私カラ進デ面會ヲ求メタコトハ一度モナク、又上司ノ命令或ハ私
ノ發意ニ基キ彼ニ情報ヲ提供シタコトモアリマセヌ。

私ハ原田ガ日誌ヲ記述シテ居タトイフコトニ就テハ一九四七年夏頃
迄全く知りマセンデシタガ其日記中ニ私ニ關係スル記事モ記載シテ
アルトノコトデ辯護人カラ私ニ關係スル記事ノ拔萃ヲ借受ケ一應通
讀シマシタ其結果私ハ私ニ關係アル記事ニ關スル限り其記事ニハ次
ニ掲グル缺陷ガ存在シテ居ルコトニ氣付キマシタ。

a 大部分ハ傳聞デアルコト

d 獨斷的想像臆測ガ多分ニ加味サレ居ルコト

u 前後ノ記事内容ニ矛盾ノ存スルコト

故意カ病的ノ快楽ノ結果カハ判断シ難キモ會見ノ動機場所及會話ノ内容等ガ歪曲偽作サレタモノノ存スルコト
陸軍及私ニ關スル記事ハ彼個人ノ愛憎的感情ノ反映シタモノガ多イコト

以下原田日記中ヨリ私ニ何等カ關係アリトシテ檢察側ヨリ強引ニ提出セラレタ證據ハ總テ信性ナキコトヲ事實ヲ基礎トシテ反證致シマス。

3

ニ法廷證三七五六A被告南ガ時ノ陸軍大臣トシテ井上大藏大臣トノ間ニ陸軍々制改革案ニ就キ一應ノ協定ヲ遂ケタガ當時ノ軍務局長被告小磯等ノ反對ニ依リ覆サレタト云フ證據ニ就テ
被告南ハ一九三一年四月陸軍大臣就任ト共ニ與陸軍ニ關シ陸軍々制少方針ヲ決定シ陸軍次官杉山元ヲ委員長トスル軍制改革審議委員會ヲ設置シ陸軍々制ニ關スル具體案ヲ立案審議セシメマシタガ當

時軍務局長デアツタ私モ委員ノ一人ニ任命サレマシタ。
一九四七年十月三十一日當法廷ニ於テ讀ミ上ゲラレマシタ、私ノ
宣誓供述書（法廷證三三七五）中ニ「滿洲事變勃發ノ前後ニ於テ
モ平時兵力十七師團ノ内近衛師團ヲ親衛隊ニ改編縮少スルノ外宇
都宮及京都ノ兩師團ヲ廢止スルコトニ就テモ研究中デアリマシタ」
ト述ベテ置キマシタノハ此審議會ニ於ケル審議ノ結果デアリマシ
テ此事實ハ南滿洲軍大臣及審議委員ガ共ニ軍縮案具體化ノ爲努力シ
テ居タコトヲ物語ルモノデアリマス同時ニ此事ハ又前項ノ法廷
證三三七五B即テ原田日記中ニ在ル國本社ハ陸軍ト連繫シテ軍縮
ニ妨害的策動ヲシテ居タト云フ記述ヲ覆ス反證デアツテ私ガ原田
ノ國本社行動記事ヲ非認スル證據トモナルノデアリマス。

右ニ師團半軍縮案實行ノ爲ニハ軍隊並軍需品ノ輸送移動、軍隊ノ機械化ニ要
スル器材ノ整備、軍隊機械化ニ伴フ一部兵營倉庫等ノ新設、縮減軍隊ノ解散
ニ伴フ將兵ノ賜金、歸郷旅費等相當額ノ初度費ヲ要スル爲軍縮案實施ノ初期
ニ於ケル陸軍豫算ハ例年度ニ比シ増額ヲ見ル事情ニ在リマシタ
而シテ井上大藏大臣ハ民政黨ノ幹部デアリマシタノデ民政黨内閣ニ於テ軍縮
ヲ實施セシノ得タト云フ名目上ノ功績ヲ把握スルト共ニ初度費ヲ要スル軍縮
案ノ實施着手ト云フ厄介ノ問題ハ之ヲ次期内閣ノ負擔ニ押付ケヨウト云フ考
カラ南陸軍大臣ニ對シテハ財政上ノ都合上實施期ヲ後年度ニ繰リ延バシ度旨
提議シタノデアリマシタ、之ニ對シ南陸軍大臣ハ軍縮ノ實施ニハ之ニ承諾ス
所ハマシタガ實施着手期ノ問題ハ尙事務當局ノ意見ヲモ徵シタ上追テ確答ス
ベキ旨ヲ述ベテ井上大藏大臣ト別レ審議委員長杉山次官ヲ招致シテ其意見ヲ
徴シマシタ、

又テ審議委員會ニ於テハ軍隊ノ機械化ハ成ルベク早キ實現ヲ希望シテ居リマ
シタ外一方軍縮着手ヲ繰リ延バス時ハ其間ニ自然、案ノ内容ガ部外ニ漏洩シ

功結果ハ單ニ軍隊將兵ノ士氣ニ惡影響ヲ及ボスノミナラズ、貴衆兩院議員ガ
 自己誤置地點ニ於ケル地方民ヲ結ビ當該地方ノ榮榮策維持ノ爲軍隊存置運
 動ニ狂舞シ之ガ爲軍隊ノ實行動モスレバ凝滯ヲ議スコトノアル若キ既往ノ經
 驗ニ鑑ミ軍隊案ガ決定ノ上ハ晩クトモ翌年初門カラ實行ニ著手スルコトガ必
 要デアルト云フ意見ニ一致シテマシタノデ杉山委員長ハ南陸軍大臣ノ諮問
 ニ對シ此旨ヲ申シタノデアリマス。審議ノ委員ノ一人デアツタ私モ亦熱心ナ
 ル軍縮決定案ノ即行論者デアツタコトハ謂フ迄モアリマセヌ。然シ直接大臣
 ニ對スル答申ハ前述ノ通り委員長杉山次官ガ當ツタノデ私ヨリ直接陸軍大臣
 ニ意見ヲ申出シタコトハアリマセヌ。
 實狀ハ以上ノ通りニシテ私ハ經理局長ハ軍縮案即行論者デアリ反對ニ原田ノ
 支持スル井上大藏大臣ハ軍縮繰リ延べ論者デアツタノデアリマス。
 原田ノ記述ハ愛憎的感情ヲ以テ曲筆セラレテハ尋リマスガ、ソレデモ尙本法
 廷書記ノ前後ヲ通讀スレバ私ノ陳述シマシタ真相ノ一端ガ明瞭ニ判斷サレ
 ルニ拘ラズ檢察官ハ被告ノ爲不刊ラシク見ユル記事ノ一端丈チ露露トシテ法

三

廷ニ提出シテ得リマス爲法廷ヲシテ私ガ軍縮案ノ實行ヲ阻止シタモノノ機ニ
反對ナ印象ヲ懷カシムル嫌ノアルモノニナツテ居ルノデアリマス、私ハ此點

ニ對シ特ニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起致シタイノデアリマス。

三、法廷等三八〇一B一九三九年五月八日私ガ原田ニ面會ヲ申込ミ彼ノ親戚宅
ニ於テ會見シ三國同盟ヲ締結セザレバ我國ノ將士ガ窮乏シナイト云ツタト記

述セラレタル證據ニ就テ

本法廷等ハ一九四八年一月二十二日「ブルックス」辯護人ヨリ指摘シマシタ
通り原田日記中ノ僅カナ一節丈ヲ摘引シ證據ノ内容ガ恰モ私ノ所說デアツタ
機ニ誤解セシムルモノデアリマスガ事實ハ左様デアリマセヌ、此證據ニ續
ク日記ノ中ニハ「常ニ常套語デアツタ」ト記シテアルノ見テモ日本文ノ解釋
上カラモ私ノ意見デナイ事ハ明デアリマス然シ日記ノ記事ハ更ニ之ニ續イテ
「小磯大將モ同ジ様ナコトヲ云ツテ居ツタ」ト揭ゲデアリマス、此「同ジ様
ナ」ト云フ文字ハ曖昧ナ表現デアリマスガ、矢張私ガ同盟締結論者デアツタ
後ナ印象ヲ與ハテ得リマスノデ會見ノ内容ハ同盟可否論者ニ就テデハナカツ

タコトヲ立證スル爲會見ノ實際經過ヲ陳述シテ本法廷證ノ無價值ナルコトヲ
證明致シマス
月日ハ明確ニ記載シマセヌガ一九三九年三月上旬私ハ原田ニ面會シタコト
ハ事實デアリマス然シ此面會ハ私ノ懇請ニ出タモトデハナク最初晚餐旁々懇
談シタイトノ原田ヨリノ申出ガアリマシタノニ對シ私ハ繁忙ノ故ヲ以テ謝絶
シマシタ然シ用済後ニテモ等支ナキニ付是非面會ヲ承引シテ貰ヒ度イトノ強
テノ申入レガアリマシタノデ私ハ已ム得ズ之ヲ承知シ用済後夕食ヲ了リ午後
八時三十分頃吉田指定ノ場所ニ出向キマシタ

其指定ノ場所トハ登記ノ被ノ現成宅デハナク品川區高輪山下龜三
郎氏ノ私宅デアリマシタ、是等ノコトハ裁判署理上直接關係ハアリマ
センガ面會ノ動機場所等ヲ原田ガ妹更ニ偽作シテ居ルコトハ其眞意ノ
何處ニ存スルカハ判ラヌニシテモ其ノ他ノ記事ノ信憑性ヲモ衷ハシム
ル一端トモナルト確信シタノデアリマス。
私ハ原田ニ會シ勞働面會ノ要件ヲ訊シマシタル處原田ハ私ニ對シ「平
沼メツセージ」ニ對スル君ノ意見ヲ聽カシガ爲デアアル。ト應答シマ
シタ。私ハ「平沼メツセージ」ニ就テハ全く知識ガテカッタノデ原田
ニ質問シ其説明ヲ得テ始メテ「平沼メツセージ」ナルモノノ梗概ヲ本
知シタノデスガ其内容ノ眞偽ニ就テハ固ヨリ判テスルコトハ出來マセ
ンデシタ。原田ハ讀テ「日本ガ若シ平沼メツセージヲ基調トシテ三
同盟ヲ締結シタ場合獨伊ガ英佛ト開戦シタナラバ日本ハ參戰スルコト
ニナルダロウカ君ノ意見ヲ聽キタイ」ト質問ヲ致シマシタ、依テ私
ハ「同盟締結ノ可否ハ別問題トシテ平沼メツセージガ果シテ君ノ説明

スル通り日本ハ可能ノ範圍ニ於テ武力援助ヲ爲スト規定セラレテ居リ
 而カモ獨伊ガ英獨ト關係シタ際ニ日本ガ獨伊ニ於テ獨伊ニ對シ武力援
 助ヲ實施シタトテラバ是レ取モ直サズニ於テ獨伊ニ對シアルト解スベキデハナイ
 カ一ト答ヘ所關平沼メツセージナルモノニ對スル解釋論ヲ表明シマシ
 タ之ニ對シ原田ハ多少昂奮ノ面持ニテ同盟締結論ヲ唱ヘル隨軍ノ態度
 ヲモ非難シ且ツ假令平沼メツセージニ依リ同盟ガ成立シタ場合ニ於テ
 モ決シテ參戰スベカラズト云フコトヲ繰リ返ヘシ論ジテ居リマシタ。
 私ハ敢テ隨軍ノ態度ナリト稱セラルモノヲ辯護モ重シマセンシ又據
 テカラ私ノ持論デアツタ同盟締結反對論ヲモ口ノ輕キ原田ニハ表明ス
 ルコトヲ差控ヘマシタ、其代リ彼ニ對シ同盟締結ノ可否ニ關スル西國
 寺公ノ意見ヲ訊ネマシタ。
 原田ハ之ニ對シ西國寺公ハ輕々ニ自己ノ意見ヲ吐露スル人デナイト答
 ヘ且ツ公ノ慎重ナル此態度ニツキ繰返シ賞讃的説明ヲ續ケテ居リマ
 シタ。

以上ノ開答ノ外左シタル要件モナイ様子ナノデ私ハ午後十時三十分頃
辭去シタノデアリマス。

以上ノ實際經過ト法廷證三八〇一Bトヲ對照致シマスト原田日記ノ内
容ハ根本的ニ事實ト相違シ其日記三二一回（一九三九年四月十八日）
ノ記事ニ於テ私が三同盟締結反對論者デアッタコトヲ誰人カラカ
キ知ツテ居タコトが明ニ窺ハレルニ拘ラズ本法廷證ニ示サル如キ
盾セル記述ガアリマスノデ檢察官ヲシテ私カ同盟締結論者ニアラザル
ヤヲ疑ハシムルニ至ッタモノト思ハレマス。

又前述ノ如ク私ハ原田ニ對シ西園寺公ノ意見ヲ質問シ原田亦同公ノ思
度ニ付賞讃的談話ヲ致シテ居タニ拘ラズ本法廷證ニ續ク日記ノ記事ニ
ハ西園寺公ノ要ニハ何等例ルルコトナク話ノ内容ヲ變更シテ全ク私ノ
豫期シテ居ナカッタ湯淺内大臣ノ態度ヲ辯護シタ記事ヲ載セテ居リマ
ス、是ハ明カニ原田カ對談ノ内容ヲ歪曲、創作セル顯著ナ一例デアリ
マシテ、日記ニ信憑性ナキコトヲ立證スルモノデアリマス。

尙法廷ニ申上ゲ度キコトハ該案官ノ本法廷提出ノ理由トシテ「小
 ハ三三同盟問題ニ關シテハ山脇陸軍次官及平沼首相ニ反對意見ヲ披
 シタコトカアル以外如何ナル場合ニモ意見ヲ表明シタコトナシト
 シタルニ拘ラズ、原田ニ對シ此ノ如ク意志表示ヲナセシニアラズヤ」
 ト陳述シマシタカ前述並シマシタ通り原田ニ對シテモ同盟締結可否論
 ニ就テハ私見ヲ披瀝シテ應リマセヌ加之私力先ニ提出シタ宣誓供
 (法廷證三三七五)原文第二十一ニハ「コノ問題ニ就テ私力出席シタ
 間暇ヤ私力記憶スル如何ナル他ノ口合ニ於テモ」ト記シテアリマス、
 然ルニ此口合(33375)ト云フ文字カ英譯ノ際場合(occasion)
 ト誤譯セラレテアル結果該案官ノ誤解ヲ招イタモノデアラウト思ハレ
 マス、若シ此誤譯カナカツタナラバ愚クハ本法廷證ハ提出サレナカツ
 タデアラウト云フコトニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起致シマス。

民法廷證三八〇六A、被告荒木が表明シタト纏セラル、私ニ對スル人格

證言ニ對テ。

本法廷證ノ内容ガ長シテ被告荒木ノ表明ニ係ルモノナリヤ否ヤハ、私
ノ固知スル所デアリマセヌ。又一カモアリ熱モアルガ定見ノナイ唯、
機謀術數ヲ事トスル所謂權ガレ屋デアルト云フ私ノ人格ニ對スル結
論的批判ニ對シテハ自己反省ノ資ニ供スル以外辯明ノ限リデアリマセ
ヌ、然シナガラ其結論的批判ノ裏付ケトモ見ルベキ。薩長紙幣ノ行使ヲ
固シテ府トデ提唱シタトカ又憲兵ニ法被ヲ着セテ滿洲ヤ支那ニ派遣シ
タトカ云フ所提唱ナ言證ニ對シテハ誰人ノ言證タルヲ問ハズ其言證ニ反駁
立證セネハナリマセヌ。

平沼内閣ノ拓務大臣時代ニ薩長紙幣ノ府トタルト他ノ如何ナル場合タルヲ
問ハズ私ガ薩長紙幣ノ行使ヲ提唱シタト云フ様ナコトハ全然無實無根
ノコトデアリマシテ固カノ誤解又ハ誤聞ナルコト疑フノ余地ザアリマ
セヌ。

次ニ憲兵ニ法被ヲ着用セシメテ滿洲、支那ニ派遣シタト云フコトヲ私ヲ
 誹謗スル口實トスルナラバ自分ガ拓務大臣デアツタノデ憲兵除ニハ關係
 ナイソコデ其時ハ恐ラク私ガ憲兵問題ニ携ルコトノ出來タ軍務局長又
 ハ次官在職間ニ限ラレマス而シテ若シコノ事ガ假リニ被告荒木カラ原因
 ニ話サレタモノトスレバ斯様ナコトヲ絕對ニ許ス管ノナイ荒木ガ陸軍大
 臣ノ職ニ就イテ居ラナカツタ時期デアルニ相違アリマセヌ、換言スレバ
 私ガ宇垣、南二代ノ大臣ノ下デ軍務局長ノ職ニ在ッタ一九三〇年八月以
 降一九三一年十二月十二日迄即滿洲軍變勃發直前、直後ノ一年四ヶ月間
 ノコトデアツタ事ニナリマス。然ルニ其當時ノ在滿日華兩門ノ兵力關係
 ハ既ニ法廷ニ於テ明ニナツタ通り中則兵力二十二萬ニ對シ日本則兵力
 ハ軍變勃發直前ニ於テハ僅カニ一萬四百軍變勃發直後朝鮮ヨリ越境ノ兵
 カヲ加ヘテモ尙一萬五千ニ充タナカツタ爲メ軍ハ著シク數回兵力ニ下
 足ヲ告ゲ若シ日本内地カラノ増兵ガ可能デアラバ憲兵等ヲ送ルヨリ

ハ一丘デモ多クノ戦闘兵ノ増派ヲ切望シテ時々言狀デアリマシタ。又
憲兵ヲモ含ム日本陸軍ノ駐劄シテ時々北支那ニ於テハ一九三一年十一
月天津ニ小規模ノ暴動事件ガアリマシタ外一般ニ靜謐ヲ保持シ憲兵増
員ノ必要等ヲ訴ヘタコトハ全然アリマセンデシタ。從ツテ滿洲事變勃
發ノ直前直後其期間ノ限ニ際レテ法被ヲ着用サセタ憲兵ヲ滿洲支那ニ
増派セネバナラヌ機ナ必要ニ直面シタコトハ一同モナク又陸軍大臣ノ
命令ノ有無ヲ問ハズ此ノ如キ處置ヲ實施シタコトハ何對ニアリマヒタ
以上反駁立證致シマシタ。而リ本法廷證ハ膚擧ナ言證ヲ背景トシタ私ニ
對スル惡意ナ人格證言デアリマス、人格證言ハ證據トシテ採擇セヌト
云フ法廷ノ定メニ從ヒ本法廷證ノ抹殺ヲ斷固ニスル次第デアリマス。

英法廷證三七五七A 被告前か建川ヲ奉天ニ派遣シメト云フ誤レル證據ニ既
ア。

本法廷證中ニハ私ニ觸レタ箇所ハアリマセヌ文ニ法廷證夫レ自公ハ私ニ
ハ何ノ關係モアリマセヌ、然シ微察官ハ本聲證提出ノ理由説明中眞証夫
レ自公ニ矛盾カ言マレテ居ルニ拘ラズ敢テ私ノ名ヲ掲ゲテ次ノ如ク述ハ
テ居リマス。

「爾ハ建川カ參事本部ヨリ奉天ニ派遣サレタコトヲ〇〇〇〇〇〇容認シナカフ
〇〇〇〇小沢カ建川ノ入選ニ何等カノ關係ガアツタコトヲ〇〇〇〇〇〇否定シ

タレ

假テ此點ノミニ就テ反証ヲ以て通致シマス。

建川ハ參事本部ノ部長アリマシメカ故ニ假ヒ起定シ彼ヲ出張サセルコ
トハ建川ノ本部長目タル參事部長ノミカ命令シタルコトデアツテ他ノ証
人ノ答察ヲモ許サナイ。然レテアツタコトハ尙且言及河邊證言ニ明テアリ
シ實又其ノ通りニ實施セラレタコトハ私ノ宣誓口供ニ明記シアアリマ
ス。

檢察官ガ書證提出ノ理由説明ニ於テ達川ハ多ク本部ヨリ派遣セラレタモ
 ノテアルコトヲ定認シテ后ルノハ前記ノ原則ヲ認明シタ結果デアルト信
 ジマス。然ルニモ拘ラズ一方ニ於テ達川ハ南カ派遣シタノデアルト云フ
 簡達ツタ原田日記ヲ其証トシテ法廷ニ是出シ且父陸軍省ノ者デアツ
 タ小蔵ガ參謀總長ノ命令權ニ谷塚父ハ之ヲ無効シタル様ナ意味ノ説明ヲ
 原田シテ后リマス。コトハ私ノ認明ニ當リテアリマス。
 檢察官ガ小蔵ハ達川ノ人ニ何事カノ關係ガアツタト云フコトヲ説明ニ
 使用シタ根據ハ法廷ノ記載ニ根據シテ原田日記ノ一節ヲ援用シタノデアリ
 マセウガ其ノ記載ノ末文ニ「フシイ」ト云フ字ヲ使用セラレタ后リマス。而シテ
 字ハ本法廷第二節中ニモ二回所使用セラレタ后リマス。而シテ「フシイ」ト云
 フシイ「ト云フ」文字ハ其ノ意味ノ口本語デアリコトニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起シマ
 蘇應則デアルト云フ「ト云フ」意味ノ口本語デアリコトニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起シマ
 ス。要スルニ本廷證及之ニ對シテ原田ガ遺書部内ノ指導命令ノ系統ヲ始メ
 シテ不可解ノ點多キコトハ幸ニ原田ガ遺書部内ノ指導命令ノ系統ヲ始メ

其他ノ事情ニ至シ無知哉。アツタ結果ニ外ナリマセヌ。殊ニ原因ガ一ツ
シイレト云フ又子ヲ使ハルコトハ懲戒ノ多分ニ包蔵スル記中ニ
於テモ取リ分ケ被ニ於テモ自信ナキ記中ニテアルコトヲ明白シテ居ル
テアリマス。
私ハ指揮命令ノ系統ヲ承リ參謀總長ノ職權ヲ侵サネバ實行スルコトノ由
來又建川少將ノ亦這證ニ容認シタコトハ絶對ニアリマセヌ。

本法廷證三七五四B國本社ノ注格目的ニ就イテ
 本法廷證ハ檢察官ガ原田日記ヲ渡用シ國本社ハ石傾ノ最タルモノニ
 シテ國本社ト連奉シ軍需問題ニ對シテモ策動シテ居タ國体デアルト爲
 シ私ガ一九四七年十一月「フィクセル」一檢察官ノ訊問ニ對シ答辯シ
 タルガ如ニ國体ニアラスト云フ説明ヲ理田トシテ法廷ニ提出セラレ
 タモノデアリマス
 然ルニ國本社ノ注格目的ト「フィクセル」一檢察官ノ訊問ニ對シ答辯
 シマシタ私ノ源述トノ間ニハ何等ノ關係モアリマセン何トナレバ私
 ノ當時ノ答辯ハ記録三二二七五頁ニ明カナル如ク國本社ノ目的ニ就
 イテハ誰カラモ秘カサレタコトガナイカラ知ラヌ、然シ雜誌國本ハ
 日本及日本人ノ眞ノ姿ヲ諒得サセル爲有益ナル資料デアルト爲察シ
 タト述べタノデ國本社ノ注格目的ニハ言及シテ居ラヌカラデアリマ
 ス。

又記録三二二七四頁ニ明カナル如ク私ハ地方ニ於ケル聯隊長時代ニ
於テ雜誌購讀ノ爲其曾良ト爲ツタ一人デ國本社ニハ講演會ガ催サレ
タ時一度出席シタコトガアル文デアリマスカラ同社ノ性格目的ニ關
シ自信ト責任トラ以テ陳述スル資格ハ有リマセン然シナガラ前段陳
述致シマス通り私ハ二三章緒業初ニ直接携ハリ且其研究審議ニ對シ
テノ部外ノ誰人ヲモ容喙サセアカツタ實狀ヲ承知シテ居リマス、
デ原田ガ彼一流ノ曲筆ヲ以テ國本社ガ眞實ト連繫シ且續問題ニ策動
シタト云ツテ居ル記述ガ若シ私ノ鹽運省在職期間ニ適用セララル、モ
ノナラバ明確ニ之ヲ否認致シマス

要スルニ本法廷證ハ檢察官ガ私ノ「フイクセル」一檢察官ニ對スル答
辯ヲ益曲援用シテ國本社ノ性格立證ノ爲法廷ニ提出シタモノデアリ
マシテ證據夫レ目録ハ私ニハ關係ガアリマセヌ、此等ハ一九四八年
一月十六日被告平沼ノ辯護人「ワールレン」氏ノ陳述ニ依ツテモ明ニ
サレテ居リマス。

昭和廿三年一月二十九日於市ヶ谷法院

供 述 者 小 磯 昭

右ハ當立會人ノ面前ニテ宣誓シ且ツ署名捺印シタルコトヲ證明シマス

同 日 於 同 所

立 會 人 三 文 字 正 平

Def. Doc. #3066

良心ニ從ヒ眞實ヲ逞ベ何事ヲモ默秘セズ又何事ヲモ漏加セザルコトヲ
審フ

宣
審
書

(署名)
捺印

小
説
目
録

Def. Doc. #3066

Exh. No. ---

東國陸軍裁判所

亞米利加合衆國其他

國

荒木貞夫其他

宣誓供述書

供述者 小 磯 國 昭

目分 陸軍 國ニ行ハルル方式ニ從ヒ先ヅ別紙ノ通りノ宣誓ヲ爲シタル上次ノ
如ク供述致シマス

一、原田日記（法廷證三一五〇）及原田ト私トノ關係ニ就テ
 觀察、反、或、段、階、中、私、ニ、關係、アリトシテ、法廷ニ提出セラレタル證據
 ニ對シ、反證ノ爲、陳述スルニ先立テ、原田日記及原田ト私トノ關係ニ
 就キ、必要ナリト思、盡セラル、事項ニ付、陳述致シマス。
 私ハ一九三〇年頃、初メテ、原田ヲ知り、其後、數回、面會致シマス、タガ彼
 ハ、私ガ彼ヲ知りマシタ以前カラ、西園寺公ニ對スル政界情報ノ提供
 密書トシテ、信託シ、同公ノ死去スル迄、勸告シテ居タコトヲ承知シテ
 居リマス。
 然シ、私ハ、原田ノ外ニ、中川小十郎トイフ人ガ、古クカラ、西園寺公ノ密
 書トシテハ、公ノ身邊一切ヲ擔當シテ居タコトヲ承知シテ居リマシ
 タ。
 然ルニ、誰ノ話デアツタカハ、失念シマシタガ、原田ニ就シ、次ノ様ナ
 報告ニ接シマシタ。
 原田ハ、心中、切カニ、西園寺公ヨリノ勸告ヲ、中川密書ト等ツテ居ル

が中川秘書ハ此點至極恬淡ナ立派ナ人物ナルガ爲中川、原田、兩
者間ニハ何ノ紛争モナイガ公が原田ヲ左邊信用シテ居ラレヌコト
ハ慥カデアル。

以上ノ事情ニ依リ私ハ原田カラ申入ガアツタ場合ハ面會モシマシタ
ガ、私カラ進デ面會ヲ求メタコトハ一度モナク、又上司ノ命令或ハ私
ノ發意ニ基キ彼ニ情報ヲ提供シタコトモアリマセヌ。

私ハ原田ガ日誌ヲ記述シテ居タトイフコトニ就テハ一九四七年夏頃
迄全く知りマセンデシタガ其日記中ニ私ニ關係スル記事モ記載シテ
アルトノコトヲ辯護人カラ私ニ關係スル記事ノ拔萃ヲ借受ケ一應通
讀シマシタ其結果私ハ私ニ關係アル記事ニ關スル限り其記事ニハ次
ニ掲グル缺點ガ存在シテ居ルコトニ氣付キマシタ。

a 大部分ハ傳聞デアルコト

d 獨斷的想像感測ガ多分ニ加味サレ居ルコト

u 前後ノ記事内容ニ矛盾ノ存スルコト

故意カ病的ノ快楽ノ結果カハ判斷シ難キモ會見ノ動機場所及會
話ノ内容等ガ歪曲偽作サレタモノノ存スルコト

。隨筆及私ニ關スル記事ハ彼個人ノ愛憎の感情ノ反映シタモノガ
多イコト

以下原田日記中ヨリ私ニ何等カ關係アリトシテ觀察側ヨリ松尾ニ提
出セラレタ證據ハ總テ信 性ナキコトヲ事實ヲ基礎トシテ反證致シ
マス。

ニ松尾三三五六A被告南ガ時ノ隨筆大臣トシテ井上大藏大臣トノ
間ニ隨筆々制改革案ニ就キ一應ノ協定ヲ遂ケタガ當時ノ軍務局長
被告小澤等ノ反對ニ依リ覆サレタト云フ證據ニ就テ
被告南ハ一九三一年四月隨筆大臣就任ト共ニ與會ニ隨筆々
少方針ヲ決定シ隨筆次官杉山元ヲ委員長トスル軍制改革審議委員
會ヲ設置シ隨筆々續ニ觀スル具體案ヲ立案審議セシメマシタガ當

時軍務局長デアツタ私モ委員ノ一人ニ任命サレマシタ。
一九四七年十月三十一日當法廷ニ於テ讀ミ上ゲラレマシタ、私ノ
宣誓供述書（法廷證三三七五）中ニ「滿洲事變勃發ノ前後ニ於テ
モ平時兵力十七師團ノ内近衛師團ヲ親衛隊ニ改編縮少スルノ外宇
都宮及京都ノ兩師團ヲ廢止スルコトニ就テモ研究中デアリマシタ」
ト述ベテ置キマシタノハ此審議會ニ於ケル審議ノ結果デアリマシ
テ此事實ハ南滿洲軍大臣及審議委員ガ共ニ軍縮案具體化ノ爲努力シ
テ居タコトヲ物語ルモノデアリマス同時ニ此事ハ又前項ノ法廷
證三七五四B即チ原田日記中ニ在ル國本社ハ陸軍ト連繫シテ軍縮
ニ妨害的策動ヲシテ居タト云フ記述ヲ覆ス反證デアツテ私ガ原田
ノ國本社行動記事ヲ非認スル證據トモナルノデアリマス。

右ニ師團半軍縮案實行ノ爲ニハ軍隊並軍需品ノ輸送移動、軍隊ノ機械化ニ要
スル器材ノ整備、軍隊機械化ニ伴フ一部兵營倉庫等ノ新設、縮減軍隊ノ解散
ニ伴フ將兵ノ賜金、歸郷旅費等相當額ノ初度費ヲ要スル爲軍縮案實施ノ初期
ニ於ケル陸軍豫算ハ例年度ニ比シ増額ヲ見ル事情ニ在リマシタ

而シテ井上大藏大臣ハ民政黨ノ幹部デアリマシタノデ民政黨内閣ニ於テ軍縮
ヲ實施セシノ得タト云フ名目上ノ功績ヲ把握スルト共ニ初度費ヲ要スル軍縮
案ノ實施着手ト云フ厄介ノ問題ハ之ヲ次期内閣ノ負擔ニ押付ケヨウト云フ考
カラ南陸軍大臣ニ對シテハ財政上ノ都合上實施期ヲ後年度ニ繰リ延バシ度旨
提議シタノデアリマシタ、之ニ對シ南陸軍大臣ハ軍縮ノ實施ニハ之ニ承諾ヲ
仰ハマシタガ實施着手期ノ問題ハ尙事務當局ノ意見ヲモ徵シタ上追テ確答ス
ベキ旨ヲ述ベテ井上大藏大臣ト別レ審議委員長杉山次官ヲ招致シテ其意見ヲ
徴シマシタ

又テ審議委員會ニ於テハ軍隊ノ機械化ハ成ルベク早キ實現ヲ希望シテ語リマ
シタ外一方軍縮着手ヲ繰リ延バス時ハ其間ニ自然、案ノ内容ガ部外ニ漏洩シ

功結果ハ單ニ軍隊將兵ノ士氣ニ惡影響ヲ及ボスノミナラズ、貴衆兩院議員ガ
 自己選定地盤ニ於ケル地方民同ト結ビ當該地方ノ榮榮策維持ノ爲軍隊存置運
 動ニ狂奔シ之ガ爲軍隊ノ進行動モスレバ滯滯ヲ議スコトノアル若キ既往ノ經
 驗ニ鑑ミ軍縮案ガ決定ノ上ハ晩クトモ翌年初門カラ實行ニ著手スルコトガ必
 要デアルト云フ意見ニ一致シテマシタノデ杉山委員長ハ兩院軍大臣ノ諮問
 ニ對シ此旨ヲ申シタノデアリマス。審議ノ委員ノ一人デアツタ私モ亦熱心ナ
 ル軍縮決定案ノ即行論者デアツタコトハ謂フ迄モアリマセマ。然シ直接大臣
 ニ對スル答申ハ前述ノ通り委員長杉山次官ガ當ツタノデ私ヨリ直接陸軍大臣
 ニ意見ヲ申出シタコトハアリマセマ。
 官狀ハ以上ノ通りニシテ私ハ經理局長ハ草案即行論者デアリ反對ニ原田ノ
 支持スル井上大藏大臣ハ軍縮繰リ延ベ論者デアツタノデアリマス。
 原田ノ記述ハ愛憎的感情ヲ以テ曲筆セラレテハ得リマスガ、ソレデモ尙本法
 廷審記事ノ前後ヲ通讀スレバ私ノ陳述シマシタ真相ノ一端ガ明瞭ニ判斷サレ
 ルニ拘ラズ檢察官ハ被告ノ爲不利ラシク見ユル記事ノ一端丈チ書證トシテ法

三

廷ニ提出シテマシマス爲法廷ヲシテ私ガ事結案ノ實行ヲ阻止シタモノノ様ニ
反對ナ印象ヲ懷カシムル嫌ノアルモノニナツテ居ルノデアリマス、私ハ此點
ニ對シ特ニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起致シタイノデアリマス。
三、法廷等三八〇一B一九三九年五月八日私ガ原田ニ面會ヲ申込ミ彼ノ親戚宅
ニ於テ會見シ三國同盟ヲ締結セザレバ歐戰ノ將士ガ窮乏シナイト云ツタト記
述セラレタル證據ニ就テ

本法廷等ハ一九四八年一月二十二日「ブルックス」辯護人ヨリ指摘シマシタ
通り原田日記中ノ僅カナ一節丈チ拔萃シ書證ノ内容ガ恰モ私ノ所說デアツタ
様ニ誤解セシムルモノデアリマスガ事實ハ左様デハアリマセヌ、此書證ニ續
ク日記ノ中ニハ「常ニ常套語デアツタ」ト記シテアルノ見テモ日本本文ノ解釋
上カラモ私ノ意見デナイ事ハ明デアリマス然シ日記ノ記事ハ更ニ之ニ續イテ
「小磯大將モ同ジ様ナコトヲ云ツテ居ツタ」ト揭ゲデアリマス、此「同ジ様
ナ」ト云フ文字ハ曖昧ナ表現デアリマスガ、矢張私ガ同盟締結論者デアツタ
様ナ印象ヲ與ハテマシマスノデ會見ノ内容ハ同盟可否論者ニ就テデハナカツ

タコトヲ立證スル爲會見ノ實際經過ヲ陳述シテ本法廷證ノ無價值ナルコトヲ
證明致シマス
月日ハ明確ニ記載シマセマガー一九三九年三月上旬私ハ原田ニ面會シタコト
ハ事實デアリマス然シ此面會ハ私ノ要請ニ出タモトデハナク最初晚餐旁々懇
談シタイトノ原田ヨリノ申出ガアリマシタノニ對シ私ハ繁忙ノ故ヲ以テ謝絶
シマシタ然シ用済後ニテモ差支ナキニ付是非面會ヲ承引シテ貰ヒ度イトノ強
テノ申入レガアリマシタノデ私ハ已ム得ズ之ヲ承知シ用済後夕食ヲ了リ午後
八時三十分頃官田指定ノ場所ニ出向キマシタ

其指定ノ場所トハ書證記載ノ彼ノ親戚宅デハナク品川區高輪山下龜三
郎氏ノ私宅デアリマシタ、是等ノコトハ裁判審理上直接關係ハアリマ
センガ面會ノ動機場所等ヲ原田ガ捺更ニ偽作シテ居ルコトハ其眞意ノ
何處ニ存スルカハ判ラヌニシテモ其ノ他ノ記事ノ信憑性ヲモ衷ハシム
ル一端トモナルト確信シタノデアリマス。
私ハ原田ニ會シ旁觀面會ノ要件ヲ訊シマシタル處原田ハ私ニ對シ「平
沼メツセー」ニ對スル君ノ意見ヲ諷カシマシタル爲デアル。」ト懸答シマ
シタ。私ハ「平沼メツセー」ニ就テハ全く知識ガナカッタノデ原田
ニ質問シ其説明ヲ得テ始メテ「平沼メツセー」ニ對シ「ナルモノノ梗概ヲ承
知シタノデスガ其内容ノ眞偽ニ就テハ固ヨリ判断スルコトハ出来マセ
ンデシタ。原田ハ續テ「日本ガ若シ平沼メツセー」ニ就テハ「基調トシテ三
同盟ヲ締結シタ場合獨伊ガ英佛ト開戦シタテラ日本ハ參戰スルコト
ニナルダロウカ君ノ意見ヲ聽キタイ。」ト質問ヲ返シマシタ、依テ私
ハ「同盟締結ノ可否ハ別問題トシテ平沼メツセー」ジガ果シテ君ノ説明

スル通り日本ハ可能ノ範圍ニ於テ武力援助ヲ爲スト規定セラレテ居リ
 而カモ獨伊ガ英獨ト關係シタ際ニ日本ガ要請ニ於テ獨伊ニ對シ武力援
 助ヲ實施シタトテラバ是レ収モ直サズニ於テ獨伊ニ對シ武力援
 カ一ト答ヘ所關平沼メツセージナルモノニ對スル解釋論ヲ表明シマシ
 タ之ニ對シ原田ハ多少昂奮ノ面持ニテ同盟締結論ヲ唱ヘル隨軍ノ態度
 ヲモ非難シ且ツ假令平沼メツセージニ依リ同盟ガ成立シタ場合ニ於テ
 モ決シテ參戰スベカラズト云フコトヲ繰リ返ヘシ論ジテ居リマシタ。
 私ハ敢テ隨軍ノ態度ナリト稱セラルルモノヲ擁護モ要シマセンシ又豫
 テカラ私ノ持論デアツタ同盟締結反對論ヲモ口ノ輕キ原田ニハ表明ス
 ルコトヲ差控ヘマシタ、其代リ彼ニ對シ同盟締結ノ可否ニ關スル西田
 寺公ノ意見ヲ訊ネマシタ。
 原田ハ之ニ對シ西田寺公ハ輕々ニ自己ノ意見ヲ吐露スル入デナイト答
 ヘ且ツ公ノ慎重ナル此種態度ニツキ繰返シ質實的説明ヲ續ケテ居リマ
 シタ。

以上ノ問答ノ外左シタル要件モナイ様子ナノデ私ハ午後十時三十分頃
辭去シタノデアリマス。

以上ノ實際經過ト法廷證三八〇一トヲ對照致シマスト原田日記ノ内
容ハ根本的ニ事實ト相違シ其日記三二一同（一九三九年四月十八日）
ノ記事ニ於テ私が三三同盟締結反對論者デアッタコトヲ誰人カラカ
キ知ツテ居タコトが明ニ窺ハレルニ拘ラズ本法廷證ニ示サルル如キ
盾セル記述ガアリマスノデ檢察官ヲシテ私カ同盟締結論者ニアラザル
ヤヲ疑ハシムルニ至ッタモノト思ハレマス。

又前述ノ如ク私ハ原田ニ對シ西園寺公ノ意見ヲ質問シ原田亦同公ノ思
度ニ付賞讃的談話ヲ致シテ居タニ拘ラズ本法廷證ニ續ク日記ノ記事ニ
ハ西園寺公ノ事ニハ何等觸ルルコトナク話ノ内容ヲ變更シテ全ク私ノ
豫期シテ居ナカッタ湯淺内大臣ノ態度ヲ辯護シタ記事ヲ載セテ居リマ
ス、是ハ明カニ原因カ對談ノ内容ヲ歪曲、創作セル顯著ナ一例デアリ
マシテ、日記ニ信憑性ナキコトヲ立證スルモノデアリマス。

尚法廷ニ申上ゲ度キコトハ檢察官ノ本法廷證提出ノ理由トシテ「小磯ハ三國同盟問題ニ關シテハ山脇陸軍次官及平沼首相ニ反對意見ヲ披シタコトカアル以外如何ナル場合ニモ意見ヲ表明シタコトナシト證言シ居ルニ拘ラズ、原田ニ對シ此ノ如ク意志表示ヲナセシニアラズヤ」ト原田シマシタカ前述證シマシタ通り原田ニ對シテモ同盟締結可否論ニ就テハ私見ヲ披瀝シテ語リマセヌ加之私力先ニ提出シタ宣誓供述書（法廷證三三七五）原文第二十一ニハ「コノ問題ニ就テ私力出席シタ間諜ヤ私力記憶スル如何ナル他ノ口合ニ於テモ」ト記シテアリマス、然ルニ此口合（*conferentie*）ト云フ文字カ英譯ノ際場合（*occasion*）ト誤譯セラレテアル結果檢察官ノ誤解ヲ招イタモノデアラウト思ハレマス、若シ此誤譯カナカツタナラバ悉クハ本法廷證ハ提出サレナカツタデアラウト云フコトニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起致シマス。

四 法廷證三八〇六A、被告荒木が表明シタト繕セラル、私ニ對スル人格
證言ニ就テ。

本法廷證ノ内容ガ是シテ被告荒木ノ表明ニ係ルモノナリヤ否ヤハ、私
ノ固知スル所デアリマセヌ。又一カモアリ熱モアルガ定見ノナイ唯、
機謀術數ヲ事トスル所謂權ガレ屋デアルト云フ私ノ人格ニ對スル結
論的批判ニ對シテハ自己反省ノ資ニ供スル以外證明ノ限リデアリマセ
ヌ、然シトガラ其結論的批判ノ裏付ケトモ見ルベキ確證紙幣ノ行使ヲ
因テノ席上デ提唱シタトカ又憲兵ニ法被ヲ着セテ滿洲ヤ支那ニ派遣シ
タトカ云フ證據ナ言證ニ對シテハ誰人ノ言證タルヲ問ハズ證據ニ反駁
立證セネハナリマセヌ。

平沼内閣ノ拓務大臣時代ニ因テノ席上タルト他ノ如何ナル場合タルヲ
問ハズ私ガ證據紙幣ノ行使ヲ提唱シタト云フ様ナコトハ全然無實無根
ノコトデアリマシテ何カノ誤解又ハ誤聞ナルコト疑フノ余地ガアリマ
セヌ。

次ニ憲兵ニ法被ヲ着用セシメテ滿洲、支那ニ派遣シタト云フコトヲ私ヲ
 誹謗スル口實トスルナラバ自分ガ拓務大臣デアツタノデ憲兵隊ニハ關係
 ナイソコデ其時ハ恐ラク私ガ憲兵問題ニ拂ルコトノ出來タ軍務局長又
 ハ次官在職間ニ限ラレマス而シテ若シコノ事ガ假リニ被告荒木カラ原因
 ニ話サレタモノトスレバ斯様ナコトヲ絕對ニ許ス管ノナイ荒木ガ陸軍大
 臣ノ職ニ就イテ居ラナカツタ時期デアルニ相違アリマセヌ、換言スレバ
 私ガ宇垣、白根二代ノ大臣ノ下デ軍務局長ノ職ニ在ツタ一九三〇年八月以
 降一九三一年十二月十二日迄即滿洲事變勃發直前、直後ノ一年四ヶ月間
 ノコトデアツタ事ニナリマス。然ルニ其當時ノ在滿日華兩門ノ兵力關係
 ハ既ニ法廷ニ於テ明ニナツタ通り中則兵力二十二萬ニ對シ日本則兵力
 ハ皇軍勃發直前ニ於テハ僅カニ一萬四百皇軍勃發直後朝鮮ヨリ越境ノ兵
 カヲ加ヘテモ尙一萬五千ニ充タナカツタ爲メ軍ハ著シク戰鬪兵力ニ不
 足ヲ告ゲ若シ日本内地カラノ増兵ガ可能デアラバ憲兵等ヲ送ルヨリ

ハ一丘デモ多クノ戦闘兵ノ増派ヲ切望シテ居タリマシタ。又
憲兵ヲモ含ム日本陸軍ノ駐劄シテ居タ北支那ニ於テハ一九三一年十一
月天津ニ小規模ノ騷擾事件ガアリマシタ。外一般ニ靜謐ヲ保持シ憲兵増
員ノ必要等ヲ訴ヘタコトハ全然アリマセンデシタ。從ツテ滿洲事變勃
發ノ直前直後其期間ノ間ニ際レテ法被ツ着用サセタ憲兵ヲ滿洲支那ニ
増派セネバナラヌ機ナ必要ニ直面シタコトハ一同モナク又陸軍大臣ノ
命令ノ有無ヲ問ハズ此ノ如キ處置ヲ實施シタコトハ何對ニアリマヒタ
以上反駁立證シマシタ。而リ本法廷證ハ所辯ナ言證ヲ背景トシタ私ニ
對スル惡質ナ人格證言デアリマス、人格證言ハ證據トシテ採擇セヌト
云フ法廷ノ定メニ從ヒ本法廷證ノ抹殺ヲ御覽ヒスル次第デアリマス。

五法廷證三七五七A 被告用か建川ヲ奉天ニ派遣シメト云フ誤レル證據ニ就
テ。

本法廷證中ニハ私ニ觸レタ箇所ハアリマセヌ文ニ法廷證夫レ自來ハ私ニ
ハ何ノ關係モアリマセヌ、然レ僥倖自ハ本誓證提出ノ理由説明中誤述夫
レ自來ニ矛盾カ當マレテ居ルニ拘ラズ敢テ私ノ名ヲ掲ゲテ次ノ如ク述ハ
テ居リマス。

一南ハ建川カ參事本部ヨリ奉天ニ派遣サレタコトヲ〇〇〇〇〇〇容認シナカフ
〇〇〇〇〇〇小沢カ建川ノ入選ニ何等カノ關係ガアツタコトヲ〇〇〇〇〇〇否定シ

タレ

假テ此點ノミニ就テ反証ヲ以て述ビマス。

建川ハ參事本部ノ部長ニアリマシメカ故ニ假ニ起定シ彼ヲ出張サセルコ
トハ建川ノ本部長目タル參事部長ノミカ命令シタルコトヲアツテ他ノ証
人ノ容喙ヲモ許サナイ。建川ハアツタコトハ有テ且河邊證言ニ明テアリ
キ實久其ノ辯リニ實施セラレタコトハ私ノ宣誓口供等ニ明記シアアリマ
ス。

檢察官ガ書證提出ノ理由説明ニ於テ建川ハ多ク本部ヨリ派遣セラレタモ
 ノテアルコトヲ定認シテ后ルノハ前記ノ原則ヲ説明シタ結果デアルト信
 ジマス。然ルニモ河ラズ一万ニ於テ建川ハ南方派遣シタノデアルト云フ
 簡述ツタ原出口記々其証トシテ法廷ニ是出シ且父陸軍省ノ者デアツ
 タ小蔵ガ參謀總長ノ命令權ニ谷塚父ハ之ヲ無効ンル様ナ意味ノ説明ヲ
 傾述シテ后リマス。コトハ私ノ誤解ニ吾ム所デアリマス。
 檢察官ガ小蔵ハ建川ノ人ニ他事カノ誤解カアツタト云フコトヲ説明ニ
 使用シタ根據ハ法廷ノ記々ニ續ク原田日記ノ一節ヲ引用シタノデアリ
 マセウガ其ノ記々ノ末又ニ「フンイレート云フ文字カ使用シタアリ又此又
 字ハ本法廷第一節中ニモ二回所使用セラレテ后リマス。而シテコノ「
 フンイレート云フ文字ハ證據價値少キ傳聞ヨリモ更ニ價值ナキ「自ラノ意
 象應則デアルト云フ意味ノ口本語デアルトニ法廷ノ注意ヲ喚起シマ
 ス。要スルニ本法廷及之ニ關連スル原田日記ノ記々内容ガ支離滅裂ニ
 シテ不可解ノ點多キコトハ幸見原田ガ遺囑部内ノ指導命令ノ系統ヲ始メ

其他ノ事情ニ對シテ無知無識ニアツタ結果ニ外ナリマセヌ。殊ニ原因ガ一ツ
シイニト云フ又字ヲ使用セラルコトハ懲戒廣則ヲ多分ニ包藏スル記中ニ
於テモ取リ分ケ被ニ於テモ自信アリキ記中ニテアルコトヲ自由シテ居ル證
テアリマス。

私ハ指揮命令ノ系統ヲ誤リ參謀總長ノ職權ヲ侵サネバ實行スルコトノ由
來又建川少將ノ亦道詮函ニ答ズンタコトハ絕對ニアリマセヌ。

本法廷證三七五四B國本社ノ注格目的ニ就イテ
 本法廷證ハ機察官ガ原田日記ヲ渡用シ國本社ハ石傾ノ最タルモノニ
 シテ國本社ト連奉シ軍備問題ニ對シテモ策動シテ居タ國体デアルト爲
 シ私ガ一九四七年十一月「フイタセル」一檢察官ノ訊問ニ對シ答辯シ
 タルガ如ニ國体ニアラスト云フ説明ヲ理田トシテ法廷ニ提出セラレ
 タモノデアリマス
 然ルニ國本社ノ注格目的ト「フイタセル」一檢察官ノ訊問ニ對シ答辯
 シマシタ私ノ源述ト「同ニハ何時ノ關係モアリマセン何トナレバ私
 ノ當時ノ答辯ハ記録三二二七五頁ニ明カナル如ク國本社ノ目的ニ就
 イテハ誰カラモ秘カサレタコトガナイカラ知ラヌ、然シ雜誌國本ハ
 日本及日本人ノ眞ノ姿ヲ諒得サセル爲有益ナル資料デアルト觀察シ
 タト述ベタノデ國本社ノ注格目的ニハ言及シテ居ラヌカラデアリマ
 ス。

又記録三二二七四頁ニ明カナル如ク私ハ地方ニ於ケル聯隊長時代ニ於テ雜誌編輯ノ爲其實良ト爲ツタ一人デ僅本社ニハ講演會ガ催サレタ時一度出席シタコトガアル文テアリマスカラ同社ノ性格目的ニ關シ自信ト責任トラ以テ陳述スル資格ハ有リマセン然シナガラ前段陳述致シマス通り私ハ二三集結案ハ直接携ハリ且其研究審議ニ對シテノ部分ノ誰人ヲモ容喙サセアカツタ實狀ヲ承知シテ居リマスノデ原田ガ彼一流ノ曲筆ヲ以テ國本社ガ二重ト運轉シ且濫問ニ東京動シタト云ツテ居ル記述ガ若シ私ノ運轉省在職期間ニ適用セラル、モノナラバ明確ニ之ヲ否認致シマス

要スルニ本法廷證ハ檢察官ガ私ノ「フイクセル」一檢察官ニ對スル答辯ヲ至曲濫用シテ國本社ノ在格立證ノ爲法廷ニ提出シタモノデアリマシテ證據夫レ自体ハ私ニハ關係ガアリマセヌ、此事ハ一九四八年一月十六日被告平治ノ辯護人「ワールン」氏ノ陳述ニ依ツテモ明ニサレテ居リマス。

昭和廿三年（一九四八年）一月三十日於市ヶ谷法廷

供 述 者 小 磯 昭

右ハ當立會人ノ面前ニテ宣誓シ且ツ署名捺印シタルコトヲ證明シマス

同 日 於 同 所

立 會 人 三 又 字 正 平

良心ニ從ヒ眞實ヲ述ベ何事ヲモ默秘セズ又何事ヲモ漏加セザルコトヲ
誓フ

宣
誓
誓

(署名)
捺印

小
説
目
録

Doc. 30043066
Errata Sheet (KOISO)

正誤表

第 十 三 頁 最 後 ノ 行 ニ 左 ノ 文 ヲ 附 加
「又、新ルコトハ、
門 庭 等 ヘ モ 及 バ ス コ ト デ ア リ マ ス」
（小 説 供 給 部 署）
第 十 三 頁 最 後 ノ 行 ニ 左 ノ 文 ヲ 附 加
「又、新ルコトハ、
門 庭 等 ヘ モ 及 バ ス コ ト デ ア リ マ ス」
（小 説 供 給 部 署）
第 十 三 頁 最 後 ノ 行 ニ 左 ノ 文 ヲ 附 加
「又、新ルコトハ、
門 庭 等 ヘ モ 及 バ ス コ ト デ ア リ マ ス」
（小 説 供 給 部 署）